UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Christianity Confronts Capitalism - *Jerome Davis*

Shakespeare's Conception of the Clergy
- - - - - - *Max Huhner*

Crime and Crime Prevention in Russia
- - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Our Youthful Certainties - *Harry Taylor*

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS

VOLUME CXIX NUMBER 5

Chicago, May 3, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 87
Jottings—J. H. H. 89

ARTICLES—
Christianity Confronts Capitalism—JEROME DAVIS 90
Shakespeare's Conception of the Clergy—MAX HUHNER 92
Crime and Crime Prevention in Russia—VICTOR S. YARROS 95
Our Youthful Certainties—HARRY TAYLOR 96
My Russian Impressions, X, XI—RABINDRANATH TAGORE (Translated by BASANTA KOOMAR ROY) 98

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Garden Wisdom—M. E. HUDSON 97
War Memorial—VIRGINIA ROSE SMITH 97
To a Young Man Dead—MARY A. HURD 97
Father and Son—EARL BIGELOW BROWN 97
Landmark—RUTH BRANSFORD WILSON 97

POETRY—
Selected—WALT WHITMAN 87
New Day—IDA ELAINE JAMES 102

THE STUDY TABLE—
Upton Sinclair Goes to Spain—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 101
A Troubadour Wanderer—MARY WHITE OVINGTON 101
New Light on the Bible—C. A. HAWLEY 102
Psychology for the Layman—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 102

CORRESPONDENCE—
F. D. R. and the Nine Old Men—ISAAC F. BAKER 103

THE FIELD—
Rosika Schwimmer to Get World Peace Prize—*International Committee for World Peace Prize Award to Rosika Schwimmer* 86
A Catholic Appeal for Peace in Spain—*Nofrontier News Service* 103
The W. I. L. Makes Direct Appeal to Gandhi and the Viceroy of India 103
Butchering Hymns—*Zion's Herald* 104
The Law of the Land—*Birth Control Review* 104
Student Drinking—*Zion's Herald* 104

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Rosika Schwimmer to Get World Peace Prize

A unique tribute is to be paid to Rosika Schwimmer, world patriot, on her sixtieth birthday, September 11, 1937. A campaign to award her a democratic peace prize has been initiated by Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, Professor Albert Einstein, Selma Lagerlöf, Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd, Mme. Eugenie Miskolczy Meller, and Romain Rolland.

They assembled an International Committee of sponsors which includes some of the most distinguished personalities of our time. Among the writers of many countries who have joined the Nobel Prize winners, Albert Einstein, Selma Lagerlöf and Romain Rolland, in their tribute to Rosika Schwimmer, are Laurence Housman, Stefan Zweig, Ignazio Silone, and Emil Ludwig.

Statesmen, politicians, and parliamentarians noted for their pacifist interest are also sponsoring the peace award to Rosika Schwimmer. They include the venerable Michael Hainisch, first President of the Austrian Republic; Mme. C. Brunschvicg, first woman member of the French Cabinet; Count Michael Károlyi, ex-President of the Hungarian Republic; Mme. Maria Martinez Sierra, author of many stage successes and now member of the Spanish Legation in Switzerland; Miss Ellen Wilkinson, M.P.; Mme. W. van Itallie van Embden, former member of the Dutch Parliament; Betsy Kjelsberg and Henni Forchhammer of Denmark, who have represented their Government at the League of Nations.

Some of the pioneers and coworkers with Rosika Schwimmer in the peace, woman suffrage, and birth control movements, who are sponsoring this celebration are Miss Alice Stone Blackwell, Mrs. Margaret Sanger, Miss Emily G. Balch, Dr. Hannah M. Stone, Miss Belle Sherwin, Dr. Mary E. Woolley, Miss Doris Stevens, Miss Katherine D. Blake, Mrs. Maud Nathan, Mrs. Inez Haynes Irwin, Mrs. Edgerton Parsons, Mrs. Emily Newell Blair, Miss E. Sylvia Pankhurst, Mrs. Emmeline Pethick Lawrence,

(*Continued on page* 103)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXIX MONDAY, MAY 3, 1937 No. 5

HUMAN PROGRESS

Forever alive, forever forward,
Stately, solemn, sad, withdrawn, baffled, mad, turbulent, feeble, dissatisfied,
Desperate, proud, fond, sick, accepted by men, rejected by men,
They go! They go! I know that they go, but I know not where they go;
But I know that they go toward the best—toward something great.

—Song of the Open Road,
Walt Whitman.

THE MENACE OF DISAPPEARING MINORITIES

The essence and glory of democracy are found in the presence of militant minorities. We shall know that England is the greatest democracy in the world just so long as "His Majesty's Opposition" is not only tolerated but actually fostered and encouraged. America is safe just so long as every act of the majority is scrutinized and corrected and, if necessary, opposed by the minority. If the minority disappears or is acquiescent, then is democratic government seriously in danger. It is this fact which makes so alarming the present political situation in this country. The Republican Party is at the lowest ebb of power and spirit. It has all but disappeared from the Senate and it is negligible in the House. Nothing could be better for the nation's health than a decisive increase of Republican representation in both houses of Congress at the next election in 1938. More disturbing, however, is the attitude of other minority parties, not large in numbers, but supposed to be uncompromisingly in the opposition. So far from setting themselves against the existing regime in Washington, these parties have lent it their ungrudging support. The American Labor Party, for example, is nothing but an adjunct of the Democratic Party, and its leaders members of the administration. The Farmer-Labor Party is a similar adjunct, seeking for nothing in recent years but a seat on the Roosevelt band-wagon. The Socialist Party on every critical issue has gone right along with the President, as witness the recent action of Norman Thomas in accepting gratefully the crumb of Supreme Court reform from the master's table. As for the Communist Party, it opposed only Mr. Landon in the last election, and did nothing quite so effectively as to turn votes to Mr. Roosevelt. All this we call a betrayal of trust. These minority parties do not exist to lick up the dust in the President's path. Their business is not to applaud but to oppose an administration with which at bottom they have no accord of principle but only agreement on inconsequential points of passing expediency. For years, now, there has been no check upon the White House. It is for this reason that we are so far advanced toward one-man rule. Perhaps some day the minority groups will wake up and ask what they exist for.

DIVISION EVERY WHICH-WAY!

In the beginning of the controversy over the Supreme Court, attempt was made to prove that opposition to the President was a betrayal of liberalism—that all liberals must be for the President, as all reactionaries were against him! But now all such supposition has been proved fantastic. The issue of the Court is splitting us in every direction. Every group is being broken up, with new alignments forming everywhere. For example! UNITY, which is commonly rated as the most radical of religious papers, is against the President, but the Roman Catholic *Commonweal,* thoroughly conservative, is backing the President. Senator Wheeler, of Montana, running-mate of LaFollette in the 1924 campaign and ardent progressive ever since, is the leader of the opposition forces in Washington, but Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, as standpat as his name, is standing staunchly by the White House. Oswald Garrison Villard, liberal of liberals, is fighting the packing of the Court, but Arthur Krock, Washington correspondent of the New York *Times,* is working for it. The liberal world is hopelessly divided. Thus, the *New Republic* is in favor of the President's policy, but its most valued contributing editor, John T. Flynn, appeared before the Senate Committee in opposition to the measure. The editors of the *Nation* are whooping it up for Mr. Roosevelt, but the owner and publisher of this paper, Mr. Maurice Wertheim, has publicly and sternly rebuked his board. The *World-Telegram* of New York, a member of the progressive Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers, has set itself against the presidential program, but its chief columnist, Heywood Broun, is dancing a daily war-dance in its favor. What impresses us ever more and more, as the debate waxes ever warmer and warmer, is the madness of the President in spread-

ing this wild confusion at the very moment when he had in his hands such united and enthusiastic support as no other chief executive in our history has ever won. What an opening for his second administration—a great leader, with an army at his back to march to triumph! Then, without an instant's warning, this bomb which has scattered the ranks! Mr. Roosevelt's party is hopelessly split; the great body of his liberal support is sown to the winds; the people are confused, dismayed, and angry. And meanwhile Congress is paralyzed, legislation at a standstill, and the country running around in circles. If the President is a great politician, as we have been told, his genius certainly failed him this time. No matter how the fight comes out in the end, the damage is irreparable.

THE WAGNER LAW DECISIONS

Just how much difference in the fight over the Supreme Court the five decisions in the Wagner Law cases will make, we cannot now say. Our guess is that, unless the President withdraws his proposal, which is unlikely, the present line-up of forces will continue, and the battle be fought through *not* to a finish, but to some kind of a compromise which will leave the independence of the judiciary undamaged and undiminished by any such packing proceedings as that which shocked the nation in its contemplation of the Roosevelt program. A constitutional amendment is obviously the way out. Meanwhile, these Wagner Law decisions have left the President looking pretty silly. Go back to his original message to Congress indicting the Supreme Court for delay, decrepitude, inaction, and reaction, and see how ridiculous the whole thing now appears! We doubt if any presidential paper in our history ever so soon became discredited. And the reason is that this paper was never honest. The President never had any real case against the Court, and so he made one up out of the tissues of prejudice and partisan pride. What we now see is that we have always had a liberal Court—liberal by a small margin, to be sure, but still in the majority minded to go right along with the President so far as might be legally and humanly possible. If the way has at any time been blocked, it is not because the Court is composed of senile old men, or made up predominantly of reactionary mossbacks, or even dominated by a weather-vane (Justice Roberts), but rather because the laws passed by Congress have in many cases been flagrantly unconstitutional—as see the unanimous vote against the NRA—or else these laws have been badly presented by their official advocates. What we need is not a new Court, but, first, a Congress which knows how to legislate inside the Constitution, and, secondly, an Attorney General who knows how to present his cases. At bottom, we have had during the last four years a government which has undertaken to do any old thing in any old way that suited its impulsive purposes. The Supreme Court has simply reminded the administration that in a democracy there are right and wrong ways of doing things. The Court has simply been trying to keep the government on the track, that's all. Why get excited?

PASS THE FEDERAL ANTI-LYNCHING BILL

The Governor of Mississippi was making an address on April 13th last, and congratulating his fellow-citizens that their fair state had not been disgraced by a lynching "in fifteen months." As he was finishing his speech, a telegram was handed him announcing the ferocious butchery of two Negroes in the town of Winona by a mob of more than a hundred whites. These Negroes, seized from the sheriff, were taken to a secluded wooded spot, stripped to the waist, and chained to trees. A blow-torch was then produced, and flames sprayed on the naked breasts of the victims until in their agony they "confessed" their crime. One of the blacks was then riddled with bullets, and the other less mercifully drenched in gasoline and burned alive. And we rave in this country at what is done in German concentration camps and in Ethiopian villages and in Spanish towns! Is anything done in any of these dreadful places any worse than this horror in Mississippi? At the very time these Negroes were being tortured and slain, the House of Representatives in Washington was debating the federal anti-lynching bill. In the face of such mob violence as this, why should this bill not at once be passed? In the last half-century, more than five thousand Negroes have been lynched in this country. Experience has shown through all these years, right down to this last hour and minute, that the southern states can or will do nothing to stop this monstrous evil. The whole nation suffers from the disgrace, and the whole nation should be empowered to put it forthwith to an end. Lynching has long since become a national problem calling for national action. Happily, the anti-lynching bill has already passed the House—by the impressive vote of 277 to 118. Now every effort of all humane and enlightened citizens should be bent upon the Senate, to persuade that body to enact speedily a measure dictated by every consideration of national safety and honor.

HIGH PRICES KNOW NO DICTATOR!

After working strenuously, and alas successfully, to "raise the price level," President Roosevelt is getting alarmed about high prices and is taking action to lower them. One might well query as to what the President expected to get when he undertook to "raise the price level" if not high prices. But this is not the point we propose to discuss here. What we have in mind at the moment is the question as to what the President, or anybody else for that matter, can do to control the high cost of living once it starts to go up, especially under artificial stimulus. Perhaps the recent experience of

Italy may shed some light upon this question. Ever since the Ethiopian adventure, which was of course a great inflationary enterprise, prices in the land of Mussolini have been shooting skyward. During this period the index shows an increase of no less than 69.8 per cent. When the movement upward began to attract popular attention, the "Duce" set in motion the whole price-control machinery of his government. The most heroic and persistent endeavors were made to keep prices down. Punitive measures of terrible severity were put into effect. With the result that, from November, 1935 to February, 1937

—the price of meats advanced 27.6 per cent
—the price of fuels advanced 16 per cent
—the price of vegetables advanced 10 per cent
—the price of textiles advanced 155.8 per cent
—the average cost of living advanced 69.8 per cent.

No one will doubt, we take it, that Mussolini has all the power there is in this business of government. If anybody in any country can control the processes of life, it is the Fascist Caesar in Italy. Yet this dictator has proved himself to be helpless. Economic laws have him beaten as badly on the home grounds as the Loyalists have him beaten in Spain. Which raises the question—what can Mr. Roosevelt do where "Il Duce" has failed? The President may try, as Mussolini has tried, every device known to political quacks, but unless the capitalistic inflation process itself is stopped, unless the vicious boom-depression cycle is broken, nothing can be accomplished. Watch America repeat Italy's experience this next year!

INDIA SITS DOWN!

It is perfectly evident that Britain is in sore straits in India. Having won six of the eleven provincial elections in anticipation of the new Constitution now officially in effect, the Congress Party is now refusing to function except under conditions which nullify the supremacy of British rule. Gandhi and Nehru, in other words, are using this occasion already to seek national independence as the end and aim of the Indian movement. That Britain is embarrassed by the situation thus created is clearly indicated by despatches alike from London and Delhi. The Empire has known no such crisis, in an out-and-out challenge to authority, since the thrilling days of non-coöperation in India a dozen and more years ago. Government is paralyzed through the refusal of Indians to operate the constitutional machinery while themselves occupying the offices to which they were duly elected by the franchise of the people. No one else can govern, and these Indians won't! If this isn't a sit-down strike in politics, as we now have it in this country in industry, we don't know what the sit-down strike may be. At last reports, Britain was trying to inveigle the recalcitrant Indians into some kind of conference and concession. An interview with the Viceroy is the bait placed in the trap for Gandhi —as though such an interview offered any temptation to the great leader of all India! If the Viceroy himself goes to Gandhi and seeks conference, the Mahatma will of course not refuse it. But the point is, the power in this crisis is in Gandhi's hands. India is already independent in the sense that Britain is helpless in India without Gandhi and his associate Nehru, and the great mass of people whom they now lead. We advise our readers to watch developments in this most fascinating struggle for a people's liberties now going on in our world. And we beg them to note the unchallenged ascendency of Gandhi in his country's destiny. This man holds no office, exercises no official authority, has no army nor even a policeman at his back, yet he holds greater sway than any other man alive upon this planet. When was there ever such a demonstration of the power of moral force?

Jottings

When Lewis meets Ford, then comes the tug of war!

A group of General Motors employes staged a "sit-down" strike the other day—just "as a joke," according to labor leader Homer Martin. The "joke" cost 4500 other employes in the plant the tidy sum of $30,000 in wages.

It used to be the appendix; then it was teeth; now it's sinus. Our good doctors, quite like other people, have to have an alibi.

Streicher's notorious anti-Semitic sheet, *Der Stürmer,* has discovered at last the real truth about the Duke of Windsor and Mrs. Simpson. The American lady, it seems, is a Jewess. Her real name is "Simson," which is the German name for Samson, "the mass murderer who killed thousands of Philistines for purposes of ritual murder." So this liaison was all a Jewish plot. As usual it is the Jews who are responsible for everything. What a wonderful people!

Opponents declare that the passage of the Gavagan Anti-Lynching Bill will mark "the end of states' rights." —*States' rights?* When under the Constitution was any state ever given the right to torture, mutilate, and burn alive Negroes?

The Spanish civil war is rapidly approaching the condition of a stalemate. Neither side is winning, nor apparently can win. May this not mean a "peace without victory" as the one sure method of saving Spain from ruin and Europe from the menace of the "next war"?

J. H. H.

Christianity Confronts Capitalism

JEROME DAVIS

We are beginning now to see that the system of capitalism has basic weaknesses. No longer does a generosity which builds cathedrals and endows religious institutions disguise structural defects. After these years of depression, capitalism stands indicted because of its brutal, callous devotion to Mammon. The two hundred leading corporations in the United States, controlling the great bulk of the nation's corporate wealth, are not producing for use but rather for profit. We now know that some among us are willing to plunge mankind into suffering, into starvation, perhaps even into bloodshed, in reckless pursuit of money and power. When President Roosevelt asked certain corporations to refrain from trading with Italy while she was brutally seizing Ethiopia, their answer in effect was that as long as profit was to be had they would trade with her be she devil or no.

When Christians supported the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact they did not fully realize that back of the governments of the major powers lay the financial interests which controlled their policies and, in the long run, made peaceful solutions impossible. We now know that the international policies of capitalism lead inevitably towards war. The United States Senate investigation under the leadership of Senator Nye shocked a world long grown callous to the terrific evils of the profit system. To mention only a few of their exposures: a revolution in Cuba was successful partly because one munitions firm supported one Cuban group against another; bribery by American munitions firms was shown to be all but universal in the South American trade; the French Government, the English Ambassador, American missionaries, and American naval officers all assisted in the sale of munitions. Yet it must be remembered that in doing these things the munitions firms were only behaving according to the customary practices of a capitalistic economy.

Capitalism is decadent. Its diseases are the ailments of old age and senility from which the patient cannot recover although it may live on even for decades. Christianity as practised in the United States receives the support and blessing of capitalism but only with increasing tension. The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man lead inevitably to democracy in possessions as well as in politics, but capitalism in crisis leads directly to dictatorship and fascism. Corruption, attempted control of politics by big business under the guise of Liberty Leagues, subtle pressures on church policies, education, and recreation, all are corroding our culture itself. Such conditions indicate not the healthy functioning of the different agencies in our common life, but disease. Fortunately in the long run the common people are not entirely duped by the propaganda of special privilege, so a change for the better is slowly taking place.

In the Reformation, Christianity threw overboard Authoritarianism. Every individual was to seek and find God for himself and no human potentate was to judge a man's relationship to God. All men were to be considered equal and free before God. Today there are serious students within the Christian fold who believe that capitalism itself must be similarly repudiated. They point out that capitalism, in effect, denies that all men everywhere belong in one family under a Father God, and they insist that the high calling of business should be first, last, and all the time to serve the common good. If the genuine spiritual ideals of Christianity cannot square with the ideals of capitalism, then in the end one or the other must go. A nation cannot permanently remain increasingly capitalistic and increasingly Christian at one and the same time.

In the recent political campaign big business attacked President Roosevelt for "Communist" leanings. What they actually were opposing was his democratic policies which encroached on the swollen profits of public utilities with capital structures inflated to astronomical proportions. Similarly, capitalism will violently oppose any form of Christianity which, following the high calling of God, is attacking the social injustices of our time.

Capitalism opposes Christianity because the masters of finance in their corporate capacity have no appreciation of the infinite worth of each human personality. The individual worker is a tool, a commodity, to be used when wanted and thrown away when old, just as one would throw away an old broom. Unmodified capitalism refuses to accept the doctrine of the Brotherhood of Man. Christianity demands that we seek first the abundant life for all our fellow men, while capitalism seeks first and foremost the abundant life for the property-getter, even at the expense of his fellow men. All about us lies the spectacle of a world dedicated largely to materialistic forces, where men seek for things even at the expense of purity, truth, and righteousness. It is a world where the concentration of wealth is ever growing sharper and more pronounced, where poverty is the more hideous because it is confronted on every hand with ostentation and flagrant wealth. Actually a scant 250,000 people in the United States have an income equal to 11,000,000 others. Nine to twelve million people are still unemployed and twenty millions are on relief. All this in a country which is reputed the most prosperous in the world.

Obviously something is wrong and we know now it is the capitalistic system itself. Finance capital is dedicated to private profit for the few and property for power. Thoughtful men recognize that there is a measure of truth in both these fundamental tenets of the capitalistic system. Every individual wants to have a return for services rendered, and humanity feels that private property has its place—a most useful one. It is not a question of whether a return for service rendered is justifiable. The question is whether mankind is justified in devoting its major energies to securing profit, a sum over and above wages, interest, and rent. Under the conventional capitalistic system, business is dedicated, primarily, to the pursuit of money and power. Each man in its toils is trying to see what he can *get* from others. He is considered greatest who accumulates the largest amount of wealth in the easiest possible way. To be sure, many may render service in the process, but countless others actually injure society as a whole, for nearly everywhere the concomitant of capitalism is exploitation, even in the case of those corporations which turn out goods at reasonably satisfactory prices, such as the Ford Motor Company for instance. For it can hardly be said that in the making of machines the Ford worker is toiling without exploitation, much less is he winning spiritual values. Instead he is under an autocratic master. Trade unions are in effect op-

posed. To participate in organizing effectively is to threaten one's security. If cars remain unsold or if a new model is produced, thousands of workers may find themselves on the street, wholly irrespective of the surplus millions of dollars shown on the balance sheet.

It can hardly be reiterated too often that under capitalism property is largely held for private power and profit. But if the consuming public lack their purchasing power, plants lie idle and workers are discharged. Thus in reality the efficiency of the capitalistic system is an illusion. It may indeed seem efficient when the wheels are running at full capacity, but it is grossly inefficient in a depression, when one considers the wastes of unemployment, the dole system, and the loss of potential productive power, to say nothing of the spiritual and mental losses involved in human frustration. What we need in America is more private property, not less, but it should be widely distributed and available to all. Capitalism is deliberately sabotaging the production process and preventing ownership and the use of full consuming capacity by all the nation.

This is clearly shown when we contrast potential capacity to produce and consumers' purchasing power. In 1929 if all goods and services, including the food produced and consumed on the farms in the United States, had been divided equally, the average family (4.12 persons) would have received $3,238. Actually over eleven and a half million families had less than $1,500. In 1929, the most prosperous year in the history of our country, 40% of the people had incomes below the accepted level of health and decency. Loeb and his associates in their *National Survey of Potential Product Capacity* estimated that if we had used producing plants intelligently, including available supplies and man power, we could have increased the amount available for distribution in 1929 by 42 billion dollars. Every family would then have had a potential income of $4,468. This of course is a conservative estimate, for we can always increase the size of existing plants, and new inventions are constantly making possible a larger and larger output. The failure to produce is in effect a sit-down strike on the part of capital.

Not only is there a tremendous sabotage going on in the economic life of the world because those who have exact tribute from those who have not, but this concentration of wealth places definite limits on art and culture and education, even religion itself. For culture demands surplus money somewhere and the necessary concentration of wealth is in the hands of the owning classes. These classes have unconsciously patterned their lives according to a profit economy and a capitalistic system. Consequently all culture must harmonize with this pattern. It is now, for instance, "suicidal" for an associate professor in a leading American university to write a book on capitalism, according to one of the leading religious thinkers of our time. This may be true, but what a commentary on the pursuit of truth! The scholar and teacher are dedicated (or should be) to the pursuit of truth even for its own sake and for its service value to mankind. But only in the atmosphere of freedom of thought and of speech can the best that men are endowed with come to fruition. There should not be great areas of a No-Man's Land in the intellectual realm, a sort of modern taboo, upon which social scientists and thinkers of any belief cannot set foot, or, if they venture, do so at their own risk.

This is part of the price we pay for a culture controlled by those who have. Unfortunately it is not only in the realm of scholarship but in the realm of religion that these controls and social pressures are so powerful as to be well-nigh irresistible. Few ministers would care to place on their church or Sunday School walls the most noble utterances of the greatest religious prophets, if they squarely conflicted with the standards of capitalism. For example, the statement of St. Jerome, "Opulence is theft, if not committed by the immediate possessor, then by his predecessor," would hardly be tolerated in the average urban church. Nor must the minister dedicate himself to justice for the working classes provided it jeopardizes dividends for the upper strata. One of the ministers in New Haven, a brilliant preacher, recently championed the right of labor to organize under the N.R.A. He carried the case up to the United States Labor Board and won in every judicial tribunal. But his efforts to win justice for labor resulted in the Bishop's informing him that no church in Connecticut would be willing to have him serve in its pulpit. Thus does capitalism corrode even the church and place limits to thought and action.

It is easy to persuade oneself that if only financial independence had been attained how much greater service one could render, but experience proves that the stultifying effect of large possessions is so great that few are able to escape it. Most men are harmed rather than helped by the gift of great wealth; most children are conditioned by its concomitants. If religion is preëminently a matter of spiritual values, found in the relation of God to man on the one hand and man to man on the other, then the capitalistic system can hardly be said to be creating these values. It is much more likely to be creating material values, and encouraging the spirit of acquisition and exploitation. If spiritual values come at all they are a by-product of the system in spite of its oft-avowed altruism.

Religion is a conserver of good. But religion, necessarily, must work against adverse currents in an age of capitalism. Although it wins many men to spiritual values, it does so against the powerful stream of the capitalistic order, opposing which it must concentrate much of its spiritual power. The clearest religious thinkers of our time have begun to see that capitalism itself is inimical to the best exercise of all the powers of all the people. When both the direct and indirect costs are finally understood, it will be realized that capitalism must be superseded. The great question is whether mankind to any effective degree will sense this great moral issue, and, sensing it, whether they will be able to change the system without a catastrophic interlude.

If God is working in the hearts and minds of men as truly today as in the days of old, then mankind must push on to new discoveries and new areas of human brotherhood. The Christian ethic has always demanded sacrifice, and as gains are gradually made for the Kingdom of God new times and new frontiers confront him who would follow Christ. In the next few decades the conflict will be intense between the champions of materialism, of profit, of property for power, and those who really believe in a Father God and in the spiritual values which controvert the philosophy of materialism.

Whoever degrades another, degrades me;
And whatever is done or said, returns at last to me.

—From *Song of Myself*,
WALT WHITMAN.

Shakespeare's Conception of the Clergy

MAX HUHNER

In his discussion of Friar Laurence, Coleridge comments on the fact that the depiction of the clergy by Shakespeare was far superior to that of his contemporaries. He says:

> In Beaumont and Fletcher priests are represented as a vulgar mockery, and, as in others of their dramatic personages, the errors of a few are mistaken for the demeanor of the many; but in Shakespeare they always carry with them our love and respect. He made no injurious abstracts; he took no copies from the worst parts of our nature; and, like the rest, his characters of priests are truly drawn from the general body.

While I do not wish to compare Shakespeare's delineation of the clergy with that of his contemporaries, and am willing to admit that *his* delineation is far superior to that of other writers of his time, I cannot agree with the great Shakespearian critic that they always "carry with them our love and respect," and I hope, for the reputation of the clergy of his time, that Shakespeare's portrayals are *not* "truly drawn from the general body."

As a matter of fact, Shakespeare's delineation of the clergy is extremely biased, and throughout his works he evinces a dislike for the cloth which leads him to unfair generalizations.

It must be remembered that Shakespeare was a wonderful student of human nature, far superior to any of his contemporaries. It is for *this* reason that his presentation of Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice* is a great improvement on Marlowe's *Jew of Malta,* but no one would claim on that account that Shakespeare's depiction of the Jew is a credit to the Jewish race or represents the average Jew.

And so it is with Shakespeare's delineation of the priesthood. I shall attempt to show in the present essay that the priests in Shakespeare's plays are, with very few exceptions, anything but ideal. They are portrayed as great generals, as great diplomats, but hardly ever as good or spiritual. Quite the contrary; wherever he presents us with a priest whose character is at all important, he is depicted as a schemer and a trouble-maker.

In *King John,* for instance, Cardinal Pandulph not only starts anew the war between France and England (which might be excusable in view of King John's attitude toward the Pope), but also plays fast and loose with *both* parties at the same time. In *Richard II* the clergy is in the thick of the fight, likewise scheming on both sides, but Shakespeare gives us no data by which we can judge which side was right. In *Henry IV* the priests initiate a rebellion against the king, but they never work in the interests of peace. In *Henry VI* Cardinal Beaufort (Winchester) is haughty, ambitious, unscrupulous, and does not even stop at murder to gain his private ends.*

In *Henry V,* particularly, the priest whom Shakespeare drew is more a man of war than of peace. In the opening scene of the play, Shakespeare emphasizes the fact that the clergy were responsible for the war between England and France; they assert that their object in starting the war was not from any patriotic motive but solely to save the revenue of the Church, which had been threatened by a bill passed against them in the reign of Henry IV.

When the conscience of King Henry V was troubled relative to starting such a terrible war, he addressed himself to the Archbishop of Canterbury with the following words:

> My learned lord, we pray you to proceed,
> And justly and religiously unfold,
> Why the law Salique, that they have in France,
> Or should, or should not bar us in our claim;
> And God forbid, my dear and faithful lord,
> That you should fashion, wrest, or bow your reading,
> Or nicely charge your understanding soul
> With opening titles miscreate, whose right
> Suits not in native colors with the truth;
> For God doth know how many, now in health,
> Shall drop their blood in approbation
> Of what your reverence shall incite us to.
> Therefore take heed how you impawn our person,
> How you awake our sleeping sword of war
> We charge you, in the name of God, take heed;
> For never two such kingdoms did contend
> Without much fall of blood; . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> Under this conjuration, speak, my lord;
> For we will hear, note, and believe in heart
> That what you speak is in your conscience wash'd
> As pure as sin with baptism.

In spite of the king's admonition, however, the Archbishop of Canterbury now uses all his persuasive powers in favor of war, saying, among other arguments:

> . . . . . Gracious lord,
> Stand for your own; unwind your bloody flag;
> Look back into your mighty ancestors:
> Go, my dread lord, to your great grandsire's tomb,
> From whom you claim; invoke his warlike spirit, *etc.*

All this might possibly be excusable were there a *patriotic* motive back of it, but the fact, brought out so unequivocally by Shakespeare, that the entire scheme was purely *selfish* in character, robs it of whatever little excuse might otherwise exist. It should also be noted that in all his arguments the Archbishop was ably seconded by the Bishop of Ely.

In *Henry VIII* we find the clergy, with the exception of Cranmer, depicted as unscrupulous and ambitious. The character of Wolsey is so well known as to need mention only, but the rest of the clergy portrayed in *Henry VIII* are shown to be of the same type. Well might Cranmer upbraid his enemy, the Bishop of Winchester, with the words:

> . . . . . love and meekness, lord,
> Become a churchman better than ambition.

It might be objected, however, that Shakespeare could not help himself in these delineations, because, historically, the clergymen he portrayed were just as he described them. But, surely, no writer, except one who has a strong dislike for the clergy, would go out of his way, as Shakespeare so often does, to paint their bad qualities. A devout admirer of the clergy would have been tempted to change history, so as not to bring out their failings too prominently. We know, too, that in his dramas Shakespeare *never hesitated to change English history* when it suited his purpose. But as has already been pointed out, Shakespeare does just the reverse. The miserable wrangling between the members of the clergy in *Henry VIII* (I do not refer

*I am aware of course that both *Henry VI* and *Henry VIII* are classed among the doubtful plays of Shakespeare, and that only parts of these plays were written by him. Some authorities even hold that these plays were entirely written by some contemporary and that Shakespeare merely edited them or wrote certain scenes. But even were this proved, it would nevertheless indicate that Shakespeare was at least in sympathy with the general portrayal of the main characters.

to Wolsey but to the other priests) could easily have been omitted from the play entirely (it has no important bearing on the general plot of the drama), but Shakespeare deliberately inserted it to present the clergy in an evil light. So, too, the entire first scene in *Henry V* could have been omitted, without subtracting one iota from the general plan of the play; for it was certainly not necessary to bring out so prominently the fact that the war between England and France was plotted by the clergy merely to safeguard some of their own revenues.

May I therefore now call attention to the *subconscious* prejudice against the clergy which seems to have been in the very make-up of Shakespeare's character? Time after time, when it has absolutely nothing to do with the subject under consideration, Shakespeare goes out of his way to denounce them.

In *Hamlet* (I, iii, 3), when Laertes cautions Ophelia concerning her relations with Hamlet, the chaste and innocent Ophelia replies:

> . . . . . But, good my brother,
> Do not, as some ungracious pastors do,
> Show me the steep and thorny way to heaven;
> Whilst, like a puff'd and reckless libertine,
> Himself the primrose path of dalliance treads,
> And recks not his own rede.

It would not be remarkable if a Prince (Humphrey), the brother and son of a king, descanted on the pride of the priest, nor would it surprise us to find such wicked characters as Richard III or King John casting slurs upon their honesty and virtue, but why should a chaste, religious, and innocent person like Ophelia make any such remark? She could certainly have given the same rebuff to her brother, without bringing in her criticism of the clergy at all, by saying:

> But, good my brother,
> Do not show me the steep and thorny way to heaven;
> Whilst, like a puff'd and reckless libertine,
> You tread the primrose path of dalliance,
> And reck not your own rede.

The effect of this would have been exactly the same; but Shakespeare actually went out of his way to drag in a reproach to the clergy.

At the funeral of Ophelia, Laertes says:

> I tell thee, churlish priest,
> A ministering angel shall my sister be,
> When thou liest howling.

In *Twelfth Night* (IV, ii, 2) the Clown, asked to disguise himself as a curate by putting on a clerical gown, remarks:

> Well, I'll put it on, and I will dissemble myself in't; and I would I were the first that ever dissembled in such a gown.

Nor is Shakespeare's contempt confined only to the Christian clergy. It includes the clergy of other denominations as well. It was not necessary to emphasize in *Troilus and Cressida* that the Trojan traitor in the Greek camp was a priest. In *Cymbeline* (IV, ii), Guiderius, although in deep sorrow at the supposed death of Imogen, says,

> For notes of sorrow out of tune are worse
> Than priests and fanes that lie.

In *Julius Caesar* Shakespeare betrays his subconscious contempt for the clergy in general. When Cassius (II, i) suggests that the conspirators should swear to their resolutions, Brutus indignantly rejects the proposal with the words:

> No, not an oath: * * *
> What need we any spur, but our own cause,
> To prick us to redress? what other bond
> Than secret Romans, that have spoke the word,
> And will not palter? and what other oath
> Than honesty to honesty engaged,
> That this shall be, or we will fall for it?
> Swear priests, and cowards, and men cautelous,
> Old feeble carrions, and such suffering souls
> That welcome wrongs; *etc.*

But to return to the clergy of later days. In *The Merry Wives of Windsor* Shakespeare not only depicts the Welsh parson as a ludicrous person, but also has him make a most obscene remark (which could well have been omitted, or put in the mouth of some other character). He also puts into Ford's mouth the following:

> I will rather trust a Fleming with my butter, Parson Hugh the Welshman with my cheese, an Irishman with my aqua-vitae bottle, or a thief to walk my ambling gelding, than my wife with herself; etc.

According to the psychology of Freud and his school, it is *not* what a person says, when under observation or in public, that denotes his true character, but rather what he says when caught off guard, his so-called "slips" which give us the cue to his real uncensored mind. Had Shakespeare portrayed one of his heroes making a violent denunciation of religion or of the clergy, we could not, on that account, conclude that such sentiments belonged to Shakespeare himself. We could only argue, in that case, that Shakespeare wanted to introduce a thoroughly anti-religious or anti-clerical character. But the quotations given above were not uttered by anti-religious or anti-clerical personages. Quite the contrary. Ophelia was a religious individual; Laertes, in spite of his many failings, was not at all irreligious, but was sincerely insistent that his sister should have all the religious rites of the Church. Neither was Guiderius, Brutus, or the Clown irreligious.

It must here be emphasized that although Shakespeare was the greatest master in the portrayal of human nature he was not absolutely perfect and made many obvious errors in that regard. From a purely *dramatic* point of view, it was certainly a mistake to put the anti-clerical remarks above quoted into the mouths of the personages mentioned. These are the occasions when Shakespeare is found off his guard; they may be considered his "slips" in which he reveals to us his *own subsconscious* dislike of the clergy.

As a matter of fact, with the possible exception of Cranmer, Shakespeare has never presented an ideal priest, though many of his laymen are clothed with all the noble qualities which an ideal cleric should possess.

The character of Friar Laurence in *Romeo and Juliet* is frequently cited as showing Shakespeare's conception of a good and noble priest, but a careful study of this character will show it to be no exception to the rule.

Shakespeare was certainly a great student of human nature and understood human psychology almost to perfection. He knew that "all the world loves a lover" and that in doing so, one often overlooks many important shortcomings. In *Romeo and Juliet* we are so intensely interested in the passionate lovers that we sympathize with any one who assists them, irrespective of the means employed. Shakespeare fully understood this psychological trait in our make-up and used it on more than one occasion. Let me illustrate this point by calling attention to his description of another love affair, namely, that between Jessica and Lorenzo in *The Merchant of Venice.*

Here also the beautiful description of their love arouses our profound sympathy, and we therefore lose

sight of the fact that Jessica was really a most vile, unnatural, and almost inhuman individual. She deliberately steals from her old father in the most shameful manner, and squanders this stolen property without any compunction or remorse. She leaves her father a prey to his enemies without the slightest sign of compassion. Whatever opinion we may have of Shylock, we must admit that whatever he possessed he had at least acquired within the law. Even if, according to strict ethics, he had no moral title to his wealth, there was certainly no excuse for his daughter and her lover and their accomplices to steal it from him. She stole even her father's engagement ring, held sacred by him as a keepsake from her own mother, and then traded it off for a monkey. But our sympathy is so taken up with the love of Jessica and Lorenzo that, unless we analyze the incidents closely, we entirely lose sight of and overlook their baser attributes.

And so it is with Romeo and Juliet. We not only sympathize with the intense love between them, but we also sympathize with any one who helps them. This accounts for our sympathy, our love, and respect for Friar Laurence. But let us analyze the situation.

After all, Romeo had been guilty of a serious breach of his country's laws. True, he had been provoked to the utmost; but what he had done was murder, even according to the crude laws of his time and country. Any one else committing the crime, after the Prince's express warning, would certainly have been put to death, but the Prince, taking into account the extreme provocation, as well as Romeo's high standing in the community, commuted the punishment to banishment. As a matter of fact, the Prince had declared, in one of the earlier scenes, that mere disturbance of the peace by either faction would result in capital punishment.

Despite all this, we find Friar Laurence, a churchman, a priest, one who ought to be a stern upholder of the laws of his country, not only concealing Romeo after he had been justly banished, but even deliberately advising him to call on Juliet that very night, and cautioning him to be gone before morning. Such conduct on the friar's part was certainly contrary to law, and amounted to aiding and abetting a criminal to break the law. He next enters into clumsy scheme with Juliet, and deliberately sends for Romeo to come back to Verona, another breach of his country's laws when he knew that Romeo had been legally and rightfully banished.

In *Much Ado About Nothing* the case of Friar Francis is very similar to the above. Hero, having been wrongly accused at her wedding ceremony, faints away, and is believed to be dead by the princes who accused her. Friar Francis, having faith in her innocence, thereupon advises her father and friends as follows:

> Pause awhile,
> And let my counsel sway you in this case;
> Your daughter here the princes left for dead:
> Let her awhile be secretly kept in,
> And publish it that she is dead indeed;
> Maintain a mourning ostentation,
> And on your family's old monument
> Hang mournful epitaphs, and do all rites
> That appertain unto a burial, *etc.*

Here again our sympathy for the unfortunate Hero completely overshadows the defect in the dramatic portrayal. Our sympathy extends not only to Hero, but also to the priest who, by this procedure, finally succeeds in bringing the play to a happy close.

As in the case of Friar Laurence, the scheme devised by the cleric had a good purpose. Had it been devised by a friend of the heroine, there would have been nothing incongruous about it. In *A Winter's Tale* Shakespeare presents a very similar plot, but in that case the scheme emanates from a woman, not from a priest. After all, however, in view of the high standard of the Church, is it right or even natural that a priest should devise a lying scheme which has for its object not only the deception of the parties most interested, but which at the same time makes a mockery of one of the Church's most sacred functions and celebrates funeral rites in all solemnity in connection with a person who is not dead, and does this with all the ostentation which only the rich and the influential can afford?

If we consider this aspect of Shakespeare's conception of the clergy, we might perhaps imagine Shakespeare to have been a very irreligious man. But such was certainly not the case. Only a person with deep religious feeling could have composed the prayer of the King in *Hamlet,* or the prayers and meditations found in *Henry V* and in other plays.

I do not wish to imply that the cardinals portrayed in *Henry V* or some of the other plays were really *wicked* men. I only call attention to the fact that Shakespeare depicts them as diplomats rather than as priests, and that, with the possible exception of Cranmer, he never presents any ideal or really humble and virtuous cleric. A priest in Shakespeare is generally portrayed as a schemer.

That Shakespeare had a very clear conception of what an *ideal* priest should be is beautifully set forth in the utterances of both Westmoreland and Prince John when addressing the rebel Archbishop in the *Second part of Henry IV* (IV, i, ii):

> . . . . . You, Lord archbishop,
> Whose see is by a civil peace maintain'd,
> Whose beard the silver hand of peace hath touch'd;
> Whose learning and good letters peace hath tutor'd;
> Whose white investments figure innocence,
> The dove and very bless'd spirit of peace,—
> Wherefore do you so ill translate yourself
> Out of the speech of peace, that bears such grace,
> Into the harsh and boist'rous tongue of war;
> Turning your books to greaves, your ink to blood,
> Your pens to lances, and your tongue divine
> To a loud trumpet and a point of war?
>
> * * *
>
> My Lord of York, it better show'd with you,
> When that your flock, assembled by the bell,
> Encircled you to hear with reverence
> Your exposition on the holy text,
> Than now to see you here an iron man,
> Cheering a rout of rebels with your drum,
> Turning the word to sword and life to death.

But Shakespeare never presents such an ideal priest in his plays. When he portrays an ideal character, the individual is invariably a layman, not a cleric, as, for instance, Henry VI, Katherine (in *Henry VIII*), and to a certain extent the mature Henry V.

Lest it be argued, however, that Shakespeare's biased portrayal of the clergy was due to the anti-Catholic feeling which prevailed in England in his day, it may be pointed out that both in *Henry V* and in *Henry VI* he portrays noble and ideal Catholic kings, and that in *Henry VIII* he gives us Queen Katherine, the devout Catholic queen, as a noble, forgiving, and idealistic character. We must therefore conclude that Shakespeare's prejudice appertained to the clergy generally and entirely irrespective of any religious denomination.

Crime and Crime Prevention in Russia

VICTOR S. YARROS

An important fact generally overlooked by the western world is that the heads and leaders of the Soviet Union are not merely communists and revolutionists. Many of the things they do, many of the reforms they have effected or are seeking to effect, have nothing to do with Communism, Sovietism, Bolshevism, or political revolution. The ruling group of Russia is a very advanced group, a group which believes profoundly in science and scientific humanism, and which is cultured in Matthew Arnold's sense of the term culure—they know and admire the best that has been thought and said in all the ages.

In dealing with crime and crime prevention, the Russian government is following, as far as conditions allow, and not without certain exceptions, the most progressive ideas of the criminologists of Europe and America. In this work the authorities welcome and enjoy the hearty coöperation of Russia's men of science.

The fundamental theory dominant in Russia today is that crime, aside from what the French call "crimes of passion"—jealousy, lust, and the like—is the result of destitution, hunger, idleness, aversion to drudgery and dull, monotonous work, and narrow, uneventful, stunted lives. The same causes, they believe, are responsible for drunkenness—for ages *the* curse of Russia. And, drunkenness, of course, also becomes a cause of crime.

The conclusion logically follows that employment, fair wages, membership in labor unions and other organizations, ample recreation, and the systematic cultivation of wide social and cultural interests will reduce crime, as well as drunkenness, to a minimum.

And the belief is strong in Russia that this theoretical conclusion is being verified daily in the life of the Soviet Union. There is much less crime than in the past, and the consumption of intoxicants is steadily decreasing.

In the course of a visit to the agricultural collective named after Lenin, near Moscow, the writer asked the head of that community, a woman of about forty, distinctly of the peasant type, whether crime and drunkenness were giving the collective serious concern. She declared emphatically that these problems did not greatly trouble them. "You see," she said, "we have work and substantial prosperity in this collective. We produce for the Moscow market and get good prices. We lead a full and interesting life. We have a fine club-house, where the radio supplies music, educational lectures, and news from the great world. We have our meetings and discussions. We are rebuilding our homes, our barns, and our sheds. We do not forbid drinking. But no one wants to make a beast of himself. We do not try to forget our difficulties; we try to solve them."

The collective in question is a large and successful one. It is proud of the deed from the government which confers upon it a perpetual title to the land it cultivates. "The land is ours," they say, "not the government's. We have earned our deed. Neither crime, laziness, nor drunkenness disgraces us."

In the cities, too, I was assured that crime is disappearing because of the combined influences of work—not overwork—interest in political life, membership in trade unions and coöperatives, ample recreation for all ages and groups, and the feeling that Russia is building a new civilization and removing the injustices and evils which, in all "capitalistic" countries, generate discontent and strife.

And it is a striking fact that almost everybody in Russia speaks of *"our* progress," *"our* conquests," and *"our* plans and hopes." Workers, chauffeurs, peasants, school teachers, students use language in discussing Russian affairs which identifies them with the government. And everybody speaks of crime as something anti-social, wholly unnecessary under existing conditions, strange, and even absurd. Science, coupled with good-will, they all say, will do away with crime, and the problem is not considered to be very serious even now.

The Russian methods of dealing with crime—when not political, it must be repeated—are undoubtedly humane and rational. Many offenders are not separated from their regular jobs. After conviction, they have to pay part of their earnings to the State, but this fine leaves them enough to live on. They may not stop working, however, while thus in debt to the State.

Those sent to prison are given jobs, and the claim is that the Russian prisons are factories, not dens of vice—vice consequent upon enforced idleness and isolation. A prison, moreover, is also in part a school. There are opportunities for education, vocational and cultural. Elsewhere, say the Russians, prisons are known to be schools of crime; discharged prisoners seldom "make good" or become useful and industrious citizens. In Russia, the prisons actually prepare the convicts for a life of freedom and service.

Having read in books and magazine articles that in Russia prisoners enjoy a sort of "vacation" and are allowed to visit their families and spend some time with them once a year, the writer, incredulous, naturally inquired into the truth of this, to us, odd arrangement. He was assured that the statements in question are not exaggerated. Prisoners do get vacations and are permitted to spend these periods with their families. This privilege, though, must be *earned* by decent conduct, faithful work, and willingness to take advantage of the classes and courses offered. The sullen, defiant, stupid, perverse prisoners—and there are such—are not granted the privilege of visiting their homes and families. The vacations, it is claimed, lift up the morale of the prison population and lessen the temptation to indulge in certain demoralizing and abnormal sexual practices. In the United States, by the way, these highly objectionable practices have but lately begun to attract the attention of candid and realistic criminologists.

"We are not hypocrites," the writer was told many, many times by educated Russians. "We face facts fearlessly; we are not prudish or superstitious; and we take such steps as science dictates to eradicate dangerous and unhealthy habits or tendencies." The "realism" of the New Russia is stressed on all occasions by the educated and traveled men and women of the Soviet Union.

Our Youthful Certainties

HARRY TAYLOR

My youthful certainties were brought back to me very vividly the other day through the reading of Garvin's *Joseph Chamberlain.* It was his account of the Egbaston Debating Society, especially, that brought back a flood of memories to me. I had had my training in a strangely similar group in England, and his account revived in me the burning hopes and fiery certainties of those days that seem so long ago.

Says Chamberlain, visiting the Egbaston Society long years afterwards when Secretary for the Colonies:

> "We—at least the older ones at the top of the board—will never again attain to the certainties of those earlier years. Then we declared war without the slightest regard to the Concert of Europe. We could do so with safety, for we made war on our own terms. We dismissed ministers without consulting the House of Commons. We passed measures which, unaccountably, up to the present time even, have not received the assent of the legislature: and we were prepared at a moment's notice to pronounce on the merits of any individual, however prominent, and to discuss the truth of any doctrine, however abstruse. Was there—can there have been—at this time about us any of the presumption of youth? I know not. But I do honestly believe that, at any rate, we had some of its virtues and some of its charm. The debates in my time were conducted with courtesy and toleration; they were distinguished by freshness and generosity and a true spirit of patriotism, and they were animated by that liberalism which is not political but which is founded upon a genuine abhorrence and indignation of wrong, and perhaps by a certain inexperience in redressing it. We were rather a radical group then and the prevalent liberalism of our time occasionally landed us in difficulties, since we could not always find speakers to defend more moderate opinions. . . . When we were unable to agree as to the disposal of seven pounds odd, which our treasurer unexpectedly disclosed to us, we unanimously approved the suggestion that we should buy a Tory with it!"

White was white, and black was black in those days. Either a man was one of us or he was against us, no matter what the complexion of his party. Even if the pinkness of his liberalism almost assumed roseate hues he was still anathema to us. Nay, more than that; the closer he pretended to be near our position the more he was despised and hated by each of us. How often did we thunder from our portable platforms and soapboxes that we had far, far rather have a good honest reactionary Tory any day than milk-and-watery liberals and radicals who still declined to go all the way with us.

Not one of us had the slightest doubt in our minds regarding the solution of all the problems of the world. We had solved them, one and all. We were ready at any moment to hold forth at great length upon any subject under the sun and prove with enthusiastic ardor that we knew how to set things right.

Our youthful certainties! I shall never forget the shock that came to most of us in the Labor Movement in Great Britain when the Great War descended upon us. It is true that a few voices had been warning us that such a war was inevitable but we refused to believe them. We knew—or we thought that we knew—that our comrades in Germany and in other European lands would never take up arms against each other. The very idea was unthinkable.

We were driving on serenely in our chariot of progress, confident that the Promised Land was just around the corner. Then this huge monster came in from a side road and smashed our chariot of progress to pieces. We fondly imagined that we knew all about the workings and the ramifications of the capitalist order yet we knew next to nothing of the forces inherent in that system. Today most of us are willing to confess freely that we no longer know what is going to come next. Those of us who have been close students of the economic order for twenty years or more have now completely lost those certainties of the pre-war days. We now know enough not to be certain any more.

And what is the conclusion of the whole matter? Must we forever put away our red-hot enthusiasms and certainties and decide that there is nothing much that we can do about it? Is it necessary that the events of the past twenty years should make us cynical and pessimistic? Must we forever renounce our dreams of the golden age of mankind and settle down in some little corner to conserve what remains to us and enjoy it? Are there *no* certainties in life to which we can cling?

I think that there are, and glorious ones, too. It seems to me that the dream itself, be it as finely spun as the imagination of man can spin it, stretched even to the universe beyond, is the truest and most sacred possession of the sons of men. It is the result of an urge that will never let man rest for very long. Again and yet again, adown the centuries and in many lands, men have fought and bled and died for the dream. To many of them it has been the most real thing in the world, more precious than father or mother, than husband or wife or child. It has gripped the minds and hearts of men and women for generations as has nothing else.

To me, in this year of grace, 1937, the wonder and the glory of the dream are greater than ever before. I have been forced to share it with more people than I did in the days of my youthful certainties. I have been forced to look upon myself as a citizen of the world and forced to realize that neither myself nor my nation can enter the Promised Land unless all races and colors and nations on this planet enter with me.

My certainty as to the *time* when the dream will be realized has been shattered. I do not know; nobody knows. But really that does not concern me very much after all. I must do my work on the dream today and leave it to others who come after me to add their part. To do the work that I know without doubt needs to be done close at hand is enough for me.

I look back on the days when all was either black or white and think how glad I am that I have lost that particular youthful certainty. Now I know that "All God's chilluns got wings." Not to the proletariat alone, not to this or that particular section of society, is given all of the virtues and none of the vices; not to any tribe or nation alone. The possibilities of good are in each and in all. That makes my task immeasurably easier than it was before; I have the whole world to draw on.

In the days of my youthful certainty there was of necessity a cleavage, a division, a separation of the elect from the non-elect. From now on I am of the party of humanity: All men and all women, white and black, yellow and brown, are bone of my bone and flesh

of my flesh. If you insult any one of them, if you persecute them, if you rob them, you insult and persecute and rob the rest of us. There is no salvation for me that does not include salvation also for every one of the rest of humanity.

I see that my youthful certainties have only been smashed in order that my mind and heart might find room for finer intuitions and deeper moral certainties. I must not be in as big a hurry as I have been hitherto. This mighty structure upon which we are engaged has its summit in heaven. There must be lifetimes of construction and lifetimes of pulling down and beginning again. The work itself as one goes along is its only reward.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Garden Wisdom

Against the freshened green of garden hedge
The April flowers take their sunny ease.
They've traveled far to gain this privilege—
Across the Seven Seas.

Each farthest garden corner is afoam.
With flowering shrubs in early spring array,
Each bush a lovely alien from a home
Ten thousand miles away.

From alpine meadow or from jungle track,
From Vale of Kashmir or Australian plain,
They share together plenteousness or lack
Of needed sun and rain.

The flowers know that sharers never lose,
That prejudice of race is perilous. . . . .
If they could only read the daily news,
What would they think of us?

—M. E. Hudson.

War Memorial

What have I done, oh what have I done?
I have hated my neighbor and murdered my son.
I sent him forth on an errand of terror,
His innocent courage defended my error.
I crouched by my money-bags, cringing and craven.
And watched while his bones
Were picked clean by the raven.

What have I done, oh what have I done?
I have hated my neighbor and murdered my son.
I must do something to help me forget,
I will cover his bones with a minaret.
Come great artist, and artisan come. . . . .
I've money to pay you, a goodly sum.
Build the tallest tower that money can buy,
To gleam with beauty and point to the sky.

Does it look small to you, angels of pity?
I am small too, and so is my city.
It is big enough to impress my town.
I must forget that God looks down.
What have I done, oh what have I done?
I have hated my neighbor and murdered my son.

—Virginia Rose Smith.

To A Young Man Dead

Last night the wind blew madly, and the snow
Whirled in a devil's dance across the field,
And this sad morning I awake and know
You lie in death upon your broken shield.
They say 'tis sweet and fitting so to die—
In loyal service to your country's need,
Following blindly where the generals lead,
Killing and being killed. I say they lie.
It was not fitting you should taste of death
That men who deal in guns might feel no loss;
It was not sweet that you should give your breath
For those who'll pay your mother with a cross.
But let them speak your praises with a sigh;
You'll not come back to question or deny.

—Mary A. Hurd.

Father and Son

This son of mine, God made to serve,
  They shall not send with my assent
To slay another father's son
  On foul and fiery battlement.

They shall not send him, made like God,
  For slaughter, like a fatted swine,
By someone else's son God made
  As gentle and as fair as mine.

Dear God, Thy will be done on earth
  As in Heaven it is done;—
I pray in the name of God the Father
  And His well belovèd Son!

—Earl Bigelow Brown.

Landmark

Not drouth nor wind unending
Laid your branches bare;
Nor bolt of lightning driven
In one terrific blare,

That stark and fit for firewood
You stand a stricken post,
Alone within the forest
A haunting, permanent ghost.

A sturdy, high-limbed sapling
Selected once with care,
Becomes a shameful landmark,
Since "they hung a prisoner there."*

—Ruth Bransford Wilson.

*It is a superstition in some localities that a tree always dies when a man is hung on it.

My Russian Impressions*

RABINDRANATH TAGORE

Translated from the Original Bengali by Basanta Koomar Roy

Copyright, 1937, by Basanta Koomar Roy
Author of "Rabindranath Tagore: The Man and His Poetry"

X

In the pursuit of science there should be close connection between book study and visual observation; otherwise seventy-five per cent of that study is in vain. This is true not only in the study of science, but also of other studies. In Soviet Russia the cause of education is advanced by means of museums of different subjects. These museums are established not only in big cities; but they are placed within reach of the inhabitants of the smallest villages in the distant provinces.

Another method of visual education is by travel. You all know how for such a long time I have been thinking of a traveling university in India. India is such a vast country with such countless diversities in all things that it is impossible to understand her by reading Hunter's Gazetteer. Once it was the custom in our country to visit places of pilgrimage on foot. Our places of pilgrimage are scattered all over the distant parts of India. So this system of pilgrimage was a means of thoroughly studying India, as far as possible, by personal contact and observation. If for the sake of education alone we can make our students travel all over India for five years, then their education is sure to be thorough.

When the mind is mobile, then the subjects of study are easily grasped and digested. Cows are fed both tied in the barns and free in the open fields. Similarly, school studies should be supplemented by travel studies. To study books confined in immobile class rooms inside an immobile school is not enough food for the health of the mind. We cannot deny the usefulness of books altogether. The field of knowledge is so vast that it is impossible to gather all the sheaves of learning from the fields by actual personal contact.

We have, of course, to gather the major portion of knowledge from the store-houses. But if we can take books along in our students' excursions to the universities of nature, then it becomes perfect. I have been cherishing many a desire and many a hope along the line. If I am ever provided with the means then I shall indeed start such a traveling university. But now I have neither the time, nor will the funds be forthcoming.

In Soviet Russia plans are being tangibly developed for the travel of the general public. This is a vast country inhabited by various races of mankind. It can be safely asserted that in the Czarist days there were almost no facilities for travel to cultivate mutual visits, mutual acquaintances, and mutual friendship. Traveling was a luxury then. It was possible only for the wealthy. Soviet Russia is feverishly striving to provide the same for the general public. The Soviet government has, from the very beginning, in places far and near, started sanatoriums for the tired and the sick farmers and workers of this country. The immense palaces and the mansions of the olden days are being utilized for this purpose. In these centers provisions are made both for the improvement of the health of the workers by rest and treatment, and for the improvement of their minds by education.

Those that are devoted to human service thus get a chance to help different people in different centers of health and education. In order to encourage traveling among the general public, and to provide proper conveniences of travel, centers of education have been opened along the highways. Here provisions are made for the board and room of the travelers. And here the travelers can also secure advice on different subjects of their special interests.

The Caucacus is a fit place for the study of geology. Here proper arrangements are made in these wayside centers of education and travel to diffuse special knowledge on geology. In the provinces that are specially fitted for the study of biology, special teachers of biology have been trained to carry on the work most efficiently.

In the summer thousands of persons who are anxious to travel register their names in the Soviet offices. From the month of May batches of twenty-five and thirty daily travel along various roads in numerous directions. In 1928 there were about 3,000 members in these traveling companies. In 1929, the membership rose to over 12,000.

It will not be proper for me to compare this with other countries in Europe or with America. You must always bear in mind that ten years ago the condition of the working masses of Russia was quite similar to that of the working masses of India. No one even casually thought that they needed education; that they needed rest; and that they needed medical attention. Today the kind of conveniences and attention they so easily receive are beyond the expectation of the middle classes of India; and certainly not within the easy reach of even the wealthy. And it is beyond the conception of the people of our British-civil-service-ridden country how the same dynamic currents of education are simultaneously flowing over the whole country, only changing their modes of operation to suit the special needs of different communities.

Provisions for human health in Russia travel hand-in-hand with provisions for education. The specialists of both Europe and America are highly praising the system of scientific health culture that is being practiced in Soviet Russia today. They are not exclusively engaged in having books written by fat-salaried specialists. They are intensely interested in widely diffusing proper knowledge of health-culture among the entire population of the country. And they are thoroughly alert to see that not a single soul among those who live far away from the fashionable city districts dies in unsanitary conditions; or for lack of attention and medical treatment.

Phthisis is fast invading the homes of Bengal. And ever since my visit to Russia, I seem unable to banish the following question from my mind: "How many sanatoriums are there in Bengal for the poor and dying victims of this fell disease?" Recently this question is very prominent in my mind, because the Christian missionaries are lamenting before the American

*Written in the period of 1930.—Editors.

public about the enormous difficulties in governing India.

Of course, there are difficulties. At the root of all these difficulties we find two things: the lack of education of the people of India; and the enormously costly administration of the British rule in India. Whom are we to blame for this? Russia is far from having an abundance of food and clothing; Russia, too, is a land of vast distances; Russia, too, is inhabited by divergent races of mankind; Russia, too, was afflicted with mountainous difficulties in her systems of education and public health; and yet, the causes of both education and sanitation are not being hindered in any way whatsoever. Hence, it is difficult for me not to ask: "Exactly who is responsible for these difficulties in India?"

The workers can stay in the Soviet health centers free of charge. Sanitoriums are built in connection with these health centers. Here the Russians receive not only medical treatment, but also proper diet and adequate nursing. All these arrangements are for the general public. In this general public are included many non-European races, who, according to European standards of civilization, are called uncivilized.

There are many such backward races living in the courtyards, and outside of European Russia. You can easily understand the nature of Soviet Russia's generous efforts for the spread of education amongst such races when you know the budget figures for their education in 1928: Ukranian Republic received 40 crores and 30 lakhs of rubles; Transcaucasian Republic 13 crores and 40 lakhs; Uzbekistan 9 crores and 70 lakhs; Turkomanistan 2 crores and 9 lakhs of rubles. In some of these republics the progress of education was slow on account of the prevalence of Arabic characters. So they have introduced Roman characters to facilitate the cause of education.

Let me quote two parts from the bulletin from which I am gathering this information: "Another of the most important tasks in the sphere of culture is undoubtedly the stabilization of local administrative institutions and the transfer of all local government and administrative work in the federated and autonomous republics to a language which is familiar to the toiling masses. This is by no means simple, and great efforts are still needed in this regard, owing to the low cultural level of the mass of the workers and peasants, and lack of sufficient skilled labor."

This needs a little elucidation. In the Soviet Union there are quite a few republics and autonomous countries. Most of these are not European. And their modes of life and living do not harmonize with modern times. From the quotation you can easily understand that the science of government is part and parcel of the system of education in Soviet Russia. If the official language of our country were the language of the people themselves, then it would be easy for our people to be educated in the science and practice of government. The official language of India is English. So a clear understanding of the science of government ever remains wholly beyond the conception of the general public. The government is being conducted by interpreters. There is no direct contact between the ruler and the ruled. Thus my compatriots are deprived of their legitimate knowledge of the governmental problems of their own country; even as they are deprived of their right to use arms for self-protection. The alien official language of India is tightening the noose of dependence around the necks of our people—tighter still. In my abundance of ignorance I cannot by any means comprehend the efficiency of debates in the Indian legislatures in the language of England. Thus the tax-payers are altogether deprived of a means of education.

The other part of the bulletin reads: "Whenever questions of cultural-economic construction in the national republics and districts come before the organs of Soviet government, they are settled not on the line of guardianship, but on the lines of the maximum development of independence among the broad masses of workers and peasants and of initiative of local Soviet organs."

This applies to the backward races in the Soviet Union. The Soviet officials, however, have not made arrangements to keep inactive for two hundred years. They have been active for the last ten years in removing the difficulties of these people, root and branch. From what I see and hear in Russia—I often wonder, "Are we a more backward race than the Uzbecks and the Turkomans?"

By the way, I just remember that the Russians have established museums of toys, too. I have been thinking of collecting toys for a long time. At last this work was begun in the art museum of our Nanda Lal. I have received a present of some toys from Russia. They are quite like our toys at home.

I have more to tell you about these backward races of Russia. I shall write to you tomorrow again. The day after tomorrow we reach New York. It may be possible that I shall find little time to write to you when I reach New York.

XI

I have already written to you about the Soviet endeavors to spread education amongst the backward races. Today let me give you a few illustrations:

The Bashkirs live in the region south of the Ural mountains. In the Czarist days the condition of the farmers in general was as deplorable as that of the farmers of India. They were constantly on the verge of starvation. They earned poor wages. They lacked the education to secure responsible positions in the factories. So they were consigned to the lot of the daily workers. After the Revolution, attempts were begun to grant this people an autonomous form of government.

At first the task fell on the rich land-owners, ministers, and the educated of the Czarist days. It did not turn out very successfully for the general public. Just then the military forces of Kolchak began their depredations. Kolchak was a czarist. He was backed up by the enthusiasm and support of the powerful outer enemies of Soviet Russia. As soon as Kolchak was beaten back by the Soviet army, the terrible famine began. The entire system of farming and food production collapsed.

The Soviet government after 1922 began its duties in earnest. Since then this country has begun to make titanic strides in education and in the production of wealth. Before this, the Bashkirs were almost universally illiterate. In these few years they have established eight normal schools, five agricultural schools, one medical school, two business schools, 17 technical schools, 2,495 primary schools, and 87 schools for middle primary education. There are in Bashkiria two state theatres, two museums, 14 libraries, 112 reading rooms, 30 motion picture theatres in the city, and 46 in the villages. There are plenty of boarding houses for the farmers when they come to town; 891 recreation centers; and there are thousands of radio sets in the homes of the farmers and the workers. Intellectually, Indians of the district of Birbhum are certainly of a higher type than the Bashkirs. But compare the state of

education and conveniences in Bashkiria with that of Birbhum in British India. In this comparison, the difficulties in both the cases should also be properly compared.

Of all the republics within the Soviet Union the youngest are Turkomanistan and Uzbekistan. They were founded in October, 1924. In other words, they are less than six years old. The total population of Turkomanistan is 1,500,000. Nine hundred thousand of them are farmers. And for various reasons the condition of the farms is far from satisfactory. Cattle breeding is difficult, too.

Industrialization is the only way to save countries like these; and that not to fill the pockets of the alien and domestic capitalists. Here the factories are owned by the public. They have already opened large thread factories and one large silk factory. An electric plant has been established at Ashakabad. Other cities are busy, too, with active enterprises. They need skilled workers to run factories; so they are sending numerous young Turkomans to the huge factories of Central Russia for proper education. And every one knows how difficult it is for the young men of India to receive such practical training in factories owned by foreigners.

I read in the Soviet bulletins that it is incomparably difficult to spread education in Turkomanistan. The hamlets are few and far between. There are few roads; and water is scarce. Huge deserts separate human habitations. The poverty of the people is of a depressing character.

For the time being the Soviet government is spending five rubles per head for their education. About one-fourth of the total population is composed of nomads. In connection with the schools they have also started boarding schools right near the watering places where many families congregate. They even publish a newspaper for the students.

They have established the Turkoman People's Home of education in Moscow, in an old Czarist palace by the river, surrounded by beautiful gardens. At present one hundred Turkomans are being educated there. It is about twelve or thirteen years old. The management of this house is carried on along the lines of self-government. Division of labor is honored in the management of this House; as for example, the department of health; household commission, and class committee. The department of health sees to it that apartments, classrooms, bedrooms, and courtyards are clean. If a student is sick, no matter how humble may be the position of his life, he is taken care of by this department.

There are many subdivisions in the household commission. One division looks after the personal cleanliness of the students. The class committee looks after the manners of the students in the classrooms. The representatives from different departments from the council are entitled to vote in the school council. The council of secretaries investigates into the disputes and quarrels amongst the students and non-students. Every student has to abide by the decision of this council.

There is a club in connection with this Home of Education. Here the students sing and play on musical instruments; and produce plays in their own language. There is a cinema in this club. Here the students are made acquainted with life in middle Asia. They also publish a wall newspaper.

Numerous agricultural experts have been sent to Turkomanistan for the improvement of agriculture there. More than two hundred model farms have been opened. And by proper laws regarding the management of farm and water, twenty thousand poorer peasant families are regularly supplied with farms, water, and other provisions of life.

In this thinly populated province they have established one hundred and thirty hospitals; and there are six hundred physicians. The writer of the bulletin apologetically writes:

"However, there is no occasion to rejoice in the fact, since there are 2,640 inhabitants to each hospital bed; and as regards doctors, Turkomanistan must be relegated to the last place in the Union. We can boast of some attainments in the field of modernization and the struggle against gross ignorance, though, again, we must warn the reader that Turkomanistan, being on a very low level of civilization, has preserved a good many customs of the distant past. However, the recent laws, passed in order to combat the selling of women into marriage and child marriages, had produced the desired effect."

So they are ashamed of having had established in six years' time, one hundred and thirty hospitals in a desert province like Turkomanistan! We in India are not accustomed to noticing such sense of shame. So we are rather astonished. I have noticed numerous difficulties in India. But I see no signs of any attempts for their removal. And yet there is no sense of shame in sight. Why?

To tell you the truth, I, too, heretofore lost too much of my courage to be able to hope much for my country. Like the Christian missionaries, I, too, was staggered at the sight of the difficulties in our way. Thus I was wont to think within myself: "India is so full of diverse races and diverse types of ignorance, and so full of conflicting religions that it is beyond human comprehension to guess as to when we shall be able to shake off the burden of our sufferings, and cleanse the Augean's stable of our sins."

My apprehensions were no doubt bred in an atmosphere that gave birth to the Simon Commission Report. Upon my arrival in Soviet Russia I discovered that the clock of progress was as badly stopped as in India—at least in the homes of the general public. And yet the clock that did not run for centuries is running beautifully at the winding of but a decade. At last I realize that our clock, too, could have run beautifully; but, alas, there is no one to wind the clock! I shall no more believe in the hocus pocus of the shadows of our "difficulties."

Let me finish this letter by quoting a few passages from this bulletin: "The imperialist policy of the Czarist generals, after the conquest of Azerbaijan, consisted in converting the districts inhabited by Mahommedans into colonies, destined to supply raw materials to the central Russian markets."

You no doubt remember how long ago the late Akshoy Kumar Maitra was so enthusiastic over the introduction of the cultivation of silk worms. It was under the influence of his advice that I became engaged in the cultivation of silk worms. He told me that he received much encouragement in the cultivation of silk worms from the British District Magistrate. But he was opposed every time he tried to initiate the farmers into the secrets of turning the silk-eggs into thread, and weave the threads into silk cloth.

"The agents of the Czar's government were ruthlessly carrying out the principle of 'Divide and Rule,' and they did all in their power to sow hatred and dis-

cord between the various races. National animosities were fostered by the Government; and Mahommedans and Armenians were systematically incited against each other. The ever-recurring conflicts between these two nations at times assumed the form of massacres."

It is true that the writer of the bulletin has expressed a sense of shame at the inadequate number of hospitals; but he could not resist the temptation of a little boasting by saying: "It is a fact which even the worst enemies of the Soviets cannot deny: for the last eight years the peace between the races of Azerbaijan has never been disturbed."

The government of India is not used to expressing regrets for its misdeeds. Neither do I see the doors open for self-praise.

In connection with this expression of regrets I want to clear up one point. It is said in the bulletin that in Turkomanistan the Soviet government spends five rubles per head for the education of the people. The ruble is equal to two rupees and a half. So five rubles amount to twelve rupees and a half. Perhaps there is a system of taxation to raise the money that is spent for education. But I am certain that the Soviet government has not devised means for internal feuds and civil wars in connection with the collection of this tax. [*To be continued*]

The Study Table

Upton Sinclair Goes to Spain

No Pasaran! (They Shall Not Pass.) *By Upton Sinclair. Published by the Author, Station A, Pasadena, California. 25 cents, 10 copies $1.75, 100 copies $15.*

Upton Sinclair has done a characteristically generous thing in writing this "story of the siege of Madrid" in hot haste, and publishing it not as a commercial venture but as a free contribution to the cause of Spanish freedom. He tells us that he had publishers ready to handle this book, with advance payments and royalties. But he has plunged into debt to publish it himself, and distribute it at cost and in quantity throughout the land. And what he is doing here, he is doing also abroad.

This is a superb gesture—yet we find ourselves wishing that Sinclair had not been quite so generous, for he has sacrificed to the Spanish Loyalists not only money but reputation as well. From the literary point of view, the book is poor stuff—inferior as a novel, and not even effective as propaganda. The story has much of that irresistible fascination of character and event which Sinclair can put into anything he handles. Like everything that this author has ever written, it fixes and holds attention. But, soberly considered, it is a preposterous story of preposterous people, which has the unfortunate effect of making the whole Spanish struggle seem unreal.

The story has to do with a young American, of German descent, who is a frequenter of night-clubs, loose in morals and idle of purpose. By chance he meets a Jewish Socialist, who interests him in the radical movement and tells him about Spain. The hero's German family try to interest him in Hilter propaganda and organization work in New York, but the boy is caught by the "Reds." A young Italian anarchist, Guiseppe, becomes important, and with his sister, Portia, our hero has a love affair which enjoys a few hectically incredible moments in the narrative and then is utterly forgotten. By a common impulse, shooting right out of the blue, all the young men enlist for service in Spain, and arrive just in time to fight, and some of them to die, in defending Madrid.

Upton Sinclair is all aflame for Spain, just as he was for the Allies twenty years ago. We must fight again to "make the world safe for democracy," for now, as then, to quote the Kipling line:

"The Hun is at the gate."

It is all generous and fine and heroic. But somehow it does not come off. Perhaps the memory of the last war is too close at hand. *No Pasaran!* seems to prove the proposition—which we do not accept at all!—that propaganda is a betrayal of literature. Upton Sinclair has himself proved a dozen times that this is not true. But in this work he gives ammunition to his enemies.

John Haynes Holmes.

A Troubadour Wanderer

A Long Way from Home. *By Claude McKay. New York: Lee Furman, Inc. $3.00*

Any book by Claude McKay deserves a thoughtful reading. Since his first verse in dialect describing the Negro peasants of Jamaica, he has drawn vivid pictures of the many places where he has lived: Harlem, in *Home to Harlem;* the waterfront of Marseilles, in *Banjo;* and now *A Long Way from Home* pictures his travels in western and eastern Europe and North Africa, and the people he has met.

In England he most wanted to see Bernard Shaw, and his visit was not disappointing. Shaw talked of cathedrals and so stirred his listener that McKay never missed seeing one if he were in a cathedral town. Of course he saw Wells, and says: "I liked in H. G. Wells those qualities I like in Dickens—the sentimental serving of his characters with a vast sauce of provincial humor." He knew Sylvia Pankhurst and worked with her on her magazine, *The Dreadnought.* His friends were from all classes, and one of the best portraits is of a New York pickpocket who for some time shared his home.

The high point in this poet's life was his visit to Russia in 1922. At first his position was precarious, he represented no communist group; but soon, through his friend Sen Katayama, Japanese revolutionist, he was accepted by the great leaders of the government. The Russian people at once accepted him and became immensely enthusiastic at the sight of his black face. "Never before," he says, "had I experienced such an instinctive sentiment of affectionate feeling compelling me to the bosom of any people, white or colored. And I am certain I never will again. . . . Along the Tverskaya I was suddenly surrounded by a crowd, tossed into the air and caught a number of times and carried a block on their friendly shoulders. The civilians started it, the soldiers imitated it, and the sailors followed the soldiers, tossing me higher than ever. . . . . From Moscow to Petrograd, and from Petrograd to Moscow I went triumphantly from surprise to surprise, extravagantly feted on every side. I was carried along on a crest of sweet excitement. I was like a black ikon in the flesh."

Claude McKay is back in America after his many wanderings and makes his home in New York. He has written of America:

"Although she feeds me bread of bitterness,
And sinks into my throat her tiger tooth,
Stealing my breath of life, I will confess
I love this cultured hell that tests my youth!"

This was the America of the *Masses* and the *Liberator* on which he worked as associate editor when Max Eastman, a valiant friend, was editor-in-chief—a more exhilarating New York than that of today.

The book ends with a call to the Negroes of America for greater group consciousness. "I suppose I have a poet's right to imagine a great modern Negro leader. At least I would like to celebrate him in a monument of verse. For I have nothing to give but my singing. All my life I have been a troubadour wanderer, nourishing myself mainly on the poetry of existence. And all I offer here is the distilled poetry of my existence."

MARY WHITE OVINGTON.

New Light on the Bible

BIBLE AND SPADE. *By Stephen L. Caiger. 218 pp. New York: Oxford University Press.*

Present-day scholarship studies the Old Testament people as a part of world history. This is right and proper and the only way the Old Testament can be understood. We are now permitted to see the other side of the story. No longer do historians think of "sacred" and "profane" history. History means an investigation, and the facts found are sacred. This new light on the Bible is due to the spade: hence the meaning of the title of this important book. The facts disclosed by painstaking investigation make up the new science of archaeology. This science is destined to revolutionize our ideas of the writing of history. Strictly speaking the Greeks under Herodotus and Thucydides began correctly to write the results of their investigations, hence the word history. After the downfall of Greek culture, so-called historians began to copy from each other instead of investigating sources; but they can do it no longer.

The purpose of this book is to present briefly the pertinent facts revealed by the latest investigations of archaeologists so far as they bear on the Old Testament. This means that part of the world from Persia to Greece. One needs only to recall that the literature of the Old Testament begins in Babylonia, shifts across the Fertile Crescent into Egypt; then returns to Palestine and to Persia; then finally comes the clash between Hebraism and Hellenism.

Modern archaeology according to Mr. Caiger began in 1798 when Napoleon invaded Egypt and found the Rosetta Stone. The decipherment of the three inscriptions on this stone in 1830 unlocked the silence of Egypt. At the opposite end of the Fertile Crescent in 1846 Rawlinson deciphered the Behistun inscription which broke the silence of Babylon. In 1865 the Palestine Exploration Fund came into existence, and the British turned to a serious study of ancient sites mentioned in the Bible. The development of the missionary enterprise aided the work, and finally the ancient civilizations gradually began to unfold their past.

It was a missionary who in 1866 discovered the Moabite Stone, the earliest example of the writing used by the Moabites and Hebrews. It also tells the other side of Ahab's war with Moab recounted in II Kings 3. Historians in 863 B. C. wrote with the same patriotic prejudices found in recent accounts of the World War. In 1871 George Smith discovered the Babylonian parallels to the Hebrew accounts of the flood and other early Old Testament narratives. This created a whole body of literature in itself, a new variety of "higher criticism." In 1901 the Code of Hammurabi, the Babylonian lawgiver, a contemporary of Abraham, came to light. This threw new and irrefutable light on the Mosaic authorship which threatened to cause a minor war in the church. But in the long run these discoveries only added to the correct understanding and appreciation of the Old Testament.

The twentieth century has thrown new light on every phase of Old Testament scholarship. The recovery of the Hittite Empire; the excavations at Ur, the home of Abraham; the understanding of Persia; the redating of the Exodus; and the recent discovery of the Lachish Letters all go to make the Bible a new book.

It is only natural that certain points of difference should arise in the interpretation of certain discoveries, but such differences are extremely slight. The author, has, however, in each case where opinions differ, given meticulously the evidence on each side. This book makes archaeology understandable to the layman. It should be owned, read and passed on by every lover of that great body of literature known as the Bible.

C. A. HAWLEY

Psychology for the Layman

STREAMLINE YOUR MIND. *By James L. Mursell. 254 pp. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. $2.00.*

Here is a fine book of practical psychology for the layman. A splendid introduction to psychology of a non-technical and lucid kind! Dr. Mursell proves he is perfectly at home not only in the class room at Teachers College, Columbia, but also as a writer.

Engineers have learned how to overcome all kinds of physical resistance for automobiles and airplanes. Why not learn how to overcome the resistances that we find in our minds toward learning? This, our author assures us, can be done, if we only have the will, rather than merely the wish, to make the most out of our minds, and therefore achieve success.

Some chapter headings indicate the fascination of the book: "Fumbling, Fooling, Failing, Succeeding"; "Using What You've Got"; "Eating, Drinking, Smoking, Sleeping"; "Governing Your Imagination"; and "Bogies, Obstacles, Limitations, Possibilities"; these are only a few of the fourteen challenging chapters.

A great volume for one who wants to get the most out of his mental equipment!

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE

New Day

Gently the dawn spreads an opal cloak
With the tired patience of old knowledge
Over the sins of yesterday.
Tenderly dawn obliterates hopelessness,
Covers ashen failure and black despair.
With hushing breath of mercy and beckoning gesture
Dawn urges a weary world to try again.

—IDA ELAINE JAMES.

Correspondence

F. D. R. and the Nine Old Men

Editor of UNITY:

A tremendous amount of water has gone over the dam since our President, after much study and honest deliberate thought, aided by a few judicial minds, decided on a plan to bring order out of economic chaos, relief to masses of our dispossessed and destitute citizens by circumventing the machinations of the five corporation-minded attorneys who have been packed into our Supreme Court. Sad to relate much of this opposition comes from men who in the past have displayed liberal progressive minds and were always to be found fighting for humanity; they now, however, are casting in their lot with the Liberty League and the President Baiters.

We hear much of this "institution of immeasurable dignity" which our President wants to pack. If Pearson and Allen told the truth (which undoubtedly they did) in *The Nine Old Men,* our Chief Justice has done as much as any one to weaken the prestige of this venerable institution, when he has on several occasions—as in the AAA case—voted contrary to his convictions rather than see a 5-to-4 decision handed down.

Yes, the prestige and sanctity of the Court have been weakened, but largely by the corporation-minded majority of the Court.

But, after all, our President is finally trying in the easiest and most expeditious manner possible to put over relief and security, for our country, for which he was given a positive mandate on three occasions—1932, 1934, and 1936.

He had strict orders on Nov. 3, 1936 from 27,774,358 voters to do just what he is now engaged in and if he deserves any criticism at all it is for delaying as long as he has. That 11,000,000 majority—the greatest a president ever received—was as much a rebuke to the five or six old men as it was an endorsement of the New Deal.

I am enclosing $9.00 for renewal of subscription for myself and the two friends to whom you have been sending UNITY with my compliments.

ISAAC F. BAKER.

El Monte, California.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 86)

Dr. and Mrs. Charles Vickery Drysdale.

Among the prominent Americans in an international list of over one hundred distinguished sponsors of the Peace Award are Hon. Fiorello La Guardia, Dr. and Mrs. Charles A. Beard, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Prof. Franz Boas, Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, and Mr. Paul Kellogg.

The Committee is inviting contributions to the World Peace Prize Award from individuals and organizations all over the world in a campaign to reward Rosika Schwimmer, the woman who has pioneered in many causes aimed at the betterment of human conditions, but who most of all has crusaded for world peace.

—International Committee for World Peace Prize Award to Rosika Schwimmer.

A Catholic Appeal for Peace in Spain

A number of representative French Catholics have issued a remarkable appeal for peace in Spain. They do not condemn those who are *bona fide* and convinced adherents of either side, but they denounce the atrocities which have been committed by both groups, and they particularly point out the tremendous responsibility of those who started the civil war by their criminal insurrection.

Among the signers of this appeal are: Jacques Maritain, Professor of the Catholic University of Paris; Pierre Henri Simon, Professor of the Catholic University of Lille; Paul Gemahling, Professor of the University of Strasbourg; Francisque Gay, editor of the Catholic daily, *"L'Aube";* Albert Blanchoin, Member of Parliament; Pierre Tricard-Graveron, former cabinet minister; Marc Sangnier, famous peace leader; and the Catholic writers and journalists, Jeanne Ancelet-Hustache, Etienne Borne, Georges Hoog, Emmanuel Mounier, Louis Martin-Chauffier, and others.

It is worth quoting some striking passages from this document:

From various provinces of unhappy Spain, Catholic voices have reached us mourning over the agony of a nation which is the victim of the most atrocious civil war. How could we remain indifferent to these cries? Before God and history we declare our horror over the collective assassination and the atrocities without number which have been going on in Spain for more than six months.

We protest against all those inexcusable crimes whoever may be guilty of them. We also ask: Have not those who have taken the initiative in this war—whatever may have been done later by others—a terrible responsibility for the evils and disorders which have arisen from this conflict? Everything must be done to stop this fratricidal war.

Let those men who shape public opinion understand their duties. Let them, on one side, not mask as a holy war what is really a war of extermination. Let them, on the other side, not make things worse by inciting to anti-religious hatred.

At the moment of writing, Madrid is being systematically destroyed and its population is living under the ever-present threat of death. Help in men and in war materials from abroad, the landing of complete military units, various naval incidents—all these give the Spanish war a larger aspect. The peace of the world is in danger.

We address ourselves not only to the League of Nations, but also to the governments and to every man and woman with a heart, and we ask them insistently in the name of Christ to do all they can to initiate efforts at mediation and to put to an end one of the most horrible slaughters the history of Europe has ever known.—*Nofrontier News Service.*

The W. I. L. Makes Direct Appeal to Gandhi and the Viceroy of India

The Executive Committee of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, meeting in Bruges, Belgium, has sent the following airmail letter to Mahatma Gandhi:

The Executive Committee of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, now meeting in Bruges, extends to the people of India, through you, their deep sympathy in the difficult crisis through which they are passing in their search for social reconstruction and for freedom.

We appreciate at least in some small degree the pain and struggle of the last few years, and rejoice in the unity which you have achieved in pursuit of a common ideal.

We want to express to you our deep desire and hope that, in the strength of that unity, you and other leaders of the Congress may find it possible to meet the Viceroy, for we believe that through this direct personal contact the way to understanding and peace may be found.

Also the following letter was sent to H. E., the Viceroy of India:

The Executive Committee of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, now meeting in Bruges, representing women in 18

The Field

(*Continued from page* 103)

countries in Europe, in the United States of America, in Australia, New Zealand and Canada, is deeply concerned in following the crisis which has arisen over the inauguration of the new Constitution for India.

We welcome the announcement in the British Parliament that no obstacle will be put in the way of a meeting between yourself and the leaders of the Congress Party.

We beg that not only will you allow no question of procedure to intervene, but in the cause of peace we ask that you will do all in your power to bring about this meeting with a view to finding a way—which could be accepted by the Elected Representatives of the Indian people—out of the present situation, which we view with the deepest apprehension.

Butchering Hymns

Sensitive always on the matter of race discrimination, Rev. Loyd F. Worley, the alert superintendent of the New Haven District of the New York East Conference, writes us this week a trenchant letter on the subject. He says, under date of March 4:

> On February 17, E. Stanley Jones made his notable broadcast to the Methodists as a feature of the Million Unit Fellowship. His address was printed in the church press the same week. While I have access only to the New York edition of *The Christian Advocate,* I note the following sentences were deleted:
>
> "As a step toward this, I suggest that each white church invite at least one member of the colored race to become an honored, respected member of that church and that each colored church invite at least one member of the white race to become a member of that church. That would not solve our problem, but it would proclaim that Christianity is color blind and class blind."
>
> In the new Methodist hymnal one of the most popular of the new hymns is No. 266, "O young and fearless Prophet," the words written by Dr. S. Ralph Harlow of Smith College. It is interesting to note the changes that were made in the original text by the hymnal commission. In the fourth stanza the word "color" was changed to "station." Think how much more meaningful the original would have been to a color-conscious Christian:
>
> "Create in us the splendor that dawns when hearts are kind,
> That knows not race nor color as boundaries of the mind;
> That learns to value beauty, in heart, or brain, or soul,
> And longs to bind God's children into one perfect whole."
>
> The fifth verse in the original poem was omitted entirely. It deals with another sensitive issue.
>
> "Stir up in us a protest against unearned wealth,
> While men go crushed and hungry who plead for work and health;
> Whose wives and little children cry out for lack of bread,
> Who spend their years o'erweighted beneath a gloomy dread."
>
> —*Zion's Herald.*

The Law of the Land

Physicians may give birth control information for the purpose of promoting the well-being of their patients.

A decision to this effect, recently handed down by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, is now the law of the land. The Department of Justice in Washington, D. C. announced on January 29th that the decision will not be appealed to the Supreme Court.

The legality of medically directed birth control centers and their function as public health agencies has been sanctioned. Spread the word to physicians, nurses, hospitals, social workers, mothers in your community. A new era of planned parenthood has begun!

—*Birth Control Review*

Student Drinking

Seeking the truth about college drinking, *The Literary Digest* has recently completed a questionnaire survey of the situation. No less than 1475 letters were sent out to college heads, and a like number to student editors and leaders. "In 645 pertinent replies, 581 American colleges representing every type of sectarian and non-sectarian school in the country presented their opinions on college drinking in what many of them remarked was the most comprehensive survey of this problem ever made." The *Digest* reports that the answers showed:

1. Student drinking is on the increase everywhere; but there is relatively less drunkenness.
2. Students abhor the drunk, admire the man who can drink like a gentleman.
3. One-third of the colleges replying see a great increase in beer drinking, two-thirds see an even greater increase in cocktail and high-ball consumption.
4. A vast majority of college presidents see drinking as a problem in other institutions, but not in their own.
5. Everywhere, teetotal enforcement in colleges appears to be crumbling.
6. The average undergraduate does most of his tippling off the campus.
7. Co-eds and women students in general have lost their moral revulsion against drinking.
8. Most student editors agree that repeal has aided temperance. The majority favor education *for* drinking, not against it, as a solution for the liquor problem.
9. No matter whether the state or community is wet or dry, students have little trouble in buying what they want to drink.

A study of the *Digest's* table "J. Barleycorn Goes to College" shows that there is much more drinking in educational institutions since repeal than before and that the drinking trend is strongly toward hard liquor. The whole situation calls for housecleaning not only in non-sectarian colleges but also in church institutions.

—*Zion's Herald.*

Write A Name

WIN $25

We will pay a prize of $25.00 in cash for the best name suggested for a New

NATIONAL THIRD PARTY

Send us your idea of the best name for a new National Third Party. Send it in promptly and you may be the winner in the cash prize of $25.00.

In case of a tie, that is, if more than one person suggests the name decided on as the best, those suggesting the winning name will have an opportunity to submit a slogan for a new National Third Party and the person submitting the best slogan will then be declared winner of the $25.00 cash prize.

The winner of this contest, as author of the name and the slogan, will receive wide publicity, as interest in this movement is growing rapidly. Be prompt. Send your suggestion for the new National Third Party name at once.

Mail this coupon

La Follette's Progressive,
Madison, Wisconsin.

My suggestion for a Third Party Name is:

.....
(print plainly)

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State .....